

# **Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at the University of California, Santa Barbara**

## **Professional Services Division**

**May 20, 1999**

### **Overview of This Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

### **Accreditation Recommendations**

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for the University of California, Santa Barbara and all of its credential programs:

#### **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
- Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
- Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology
- Preliminary Administrative Services
- Professional Administrative Services

- (2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- The University of California, Santa Barbara be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- The University of California, Santa Barbara be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

## **Background Information**

The preparation of teachers was the primary mission of the institutions that grew and evolved and in time became the University of California, Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara State Normal School was established in 1909 as successor to institutes that traced their roots to the early 1890's. The 1920's saw the expansion of the education program for teachers to four years and a further change in name to Santa Barbara State Teacher's College. As the curriculum became more comprehensive, enrollments included larger numbers of students who wished to pursue careers other than teaching. This led to designation of the campus as Santa Barbara State College in 1935, and a branch of the University of California in 1944. The School of Education was founded and converted to graduate level status in 1967.

The Graduate School of Education (GSE) at the University of California, Santa Barbara enrolls approximately 120 students in the following credential programs:

- Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
- Single Subject Teaching Credential with CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
- Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential Program
- Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program
- Professional Administrative Services Credential Program

Administratively, the UCSB Credential Programs come under the GSE Dean who has the ultimate signature authority for the credentials. The School Psychology Credential is housed in the Counseling/Clinical/School Psychology Program (CCSP). The Administrative Services Credential is housed in the Educational Leadership and Organizations (ELO) Emphasis. The Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials are housed in the Teacher Education Programs.

During the Summer of 1996, the UCSB Teacher Education Program submitted a proposal for an Experimental Teacher Education Program. The proposal was approved by the Commission, and the university launched the experimental program in the Fall of 1996. The Multiple and Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Programs were included in the experiment, which, according to Commission policy, can last for up to three years. 1998-99 is the final year for the Experimental Program, and UCSB will be making the transition back to the Commission's program standards during the summer of 1999.

## **Preparation for the Accreditation Visit**

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Spring, 1997 and had telephone conversations with the Director of the Teacher Education Program in preparation for a formal meeting with the Faculty which was held during the Fall of 1997. The initial meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. Telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader, Dr. Greta Pruitt was selected in August 1998.

## **Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report**

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to each credential program and for the unit as a whole. This was followed by a separate response to the Commission's Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs (Preliminary and Professional). UCSB chose to have their Pupil Personnel Services Credential reviewed under the National Association of School Psychologist (NASP) Standards, as authorized under the Accreditation Framework. A response to these standards, which have been deemed comparable to the Commission's program standards by the COA, followed the response to the Administrative Services Credential Standards in the self-study document. The final chapter of the self-study report included the original proposal for the Experimental Teacher Education Program and the first two annual reports on the program. The third and final report on the Experimental Program will not be completed until the Summer of 1999, and was therefore not included in the self-study report.

## **Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team**

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean, faculty and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of seven, structured as follows:

- Team Leader
- Common Standards Cluster – 1 member
- Basic Credential Cluster – 3 members
- Services Credential Cluster – 2 members

The Commission Consultant selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience, and adaptability, and were trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*. All but one of the team members were trained members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers.

## **Intensive Evaluation of Program Data**

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The COA Team Leader and members examined the University responses to the Common Standards and the Program Standards. The on-site phase of the review began on Monday, May 17, 1999. The team arrived on Monday afternoon and begin their deliberations with one another. The team meeting included a review of the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for the COA team members. The University hosted a dinner for the team Monday evening.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18-19, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. There was extensive consultation among the team members with much

sharing of information. Lunch on Tuesday and Wednesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Tuesday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. The mid-visit report was scheduled for 1:15 on Wednesday. The team had questions relating to four of the Common Standards and specific questions about the teacher education program going into the mid-visit report. The faculty met with the team Wednesday afternoon to present additional information for the team in order to respond to the team's questions. Wednesday evening was set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. The team finished writing the report on Thursday morning, May 20, and presented it to the faculty and administration at 11:00 a.m.

### **Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report**

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework* and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the Common Standards were "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

The team prepared a narrative report about the program standards in each credential area which pointed out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the particular program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to each program.

The team included "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

### **Accreditation Decisions by the Team**

After the report was drafted, the team met Wednesday evening for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. The team discussed each Common Standard and each Program Standard and decided on the basis of interviews and program documents that all of the Common Standards were fully met; all of the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards were fully met; seventeen of the twenty Professional Administrative Services Credential Program Standards were fully met; and all of the Experimental Program Standards and California Standards for the Teaching Profession were fully met.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that several standards in both Common and Program sections were worthy of being noted in areas of strength and in some cases, areas of concern. Although some areas of concern were noted in the team report, the overall quality of the programs mitigated the concerns. After thorough discussion, the team decided to recommend the status of "**Accreditation**". The recommendation for "Accreditation" was based on the

unanimous agreement of the team. The team felt that, overall, UC Santa Barbara is doing a superb job of preparing teachers, administrators and school psychologists.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION - ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

**Institution:** University of California, Santa Barbara

**Dates of Visit:** May 17-20, 1999

**Accreditation Team  
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of the accreditation team for ACCREDITATION was based on a thorough review of the self study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of supporting documentation, interviews with campus and field-based personnel, interviews with candidates and graduates, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The recommendation of the team was based on the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. All were judged to have been fully met.
2. Program Standards - Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas; however, a few were not fully met. The team then discussed in detail each program standard that was less than fully met.

In the Administrative Services Credential Program, all of the standards for the Preliminary Program were fully met, and all but three of the Professional Standards were fully met. Professional Standard 8 – Design of the Professional Induction Plan, Standard 12 – Curriculum Content and Standard 18 – Nature of Non-University Activities were found to be met minimally with qualitative concerns. The Team was concerned with the absence of a final assessment component, insufficient breadth and depth in professional curriculum content and lack of a formalized system of approval for non-university activities in the professional program. These concerns are substantiated in the body of the Team report.

All other program standards were fully met. After the discussion about the standards, the team discussed and then voted on the accreditation recommendation.

3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was, in part, based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met. Furthermore,

even though three standards in one credential area were met minimally, the team determined that there were compensating strengths in that program area such as consistent reports from employers that graduates were well prepared, competent and effective. The team concluded that all credential programs were effective and of high quality. Therefore, the team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supported the above accreditation recommendation without stipulations.

## ACCREDITATION TEAM MEMBERS

**Team Leader:** **Greta Pruitt**  
Los Angeles Educational Partnership

**Team Members:**

**Common Standards:** **Sherman Sowby**  
California State University, Fresno

**Basic Credential Cluster:** **Andrea Canady**  
Burbank Unified School District

**Mary Williams**  
University of San Diego

**Natalie Kuhlman**  
San Diego State University

**Services Credential Cluster:** **Dennis Evans**  
University of California, Irvine

**Viola Mecke**  
California State University, Hayward

## DATA SOURCES

## DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- X Catalog
- X Institutional Self Study
- X Course Syllabi
- X Candidate Files
- X Fieldwork Handbook
- X Follow-up Survey Results
- X Needs Analysis Results
- X Information Booklet
- X Field Experience Notebook
- X Schedule of Classes
- X Advisement Documents
- X Faculty Vitae
- X Other

## INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Services Cred. Cluster	<b>TOTAL</b>
Program Faculty	9	14	17	<b>40</b>
Institutional Administration	7	3	1	<b>11</b>
Candidates	1	89	30	<b>120</b>
Graduates		28	20	<b>48</b>
Employers of Graduates		3	7	<b>10</b>
Supervising Practitioners		15	4	<b>19</b>
Advisors		5	0 <sup>1</sup>	<b>5</b>
School Administrators	1	4	14	<b>19</b>
Credential Analyst	1	1	1	<b>1</b>
Advisory Committee Members		0	15	<b>15</b>

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>288</b>
--------------	------------

1 Faculty in the Pupil Personnel Services and Administrative Services Credential Programs serve as advisors.

## Common Standards

### Standard 1: Educational Leadership

### Standard Met

The University of California at Santa Barbara offers three credential programs in the Graduate School of Education (GSE). The Department of Education houses the academic degree programs and supports and coordinates the courses and credentials for the school psychology and administrative services credentials as well as the multiple and single subject teaching credentials. Dean Jules Zimmer has served as the Dean of the School of Education for approximately six years. The School is well-respected across campus. The faculty spoke highly of the support from the Dean, the Chancellor's Office, department chairs and program directors. The Chancellor is supportive of the School's mission. All programs are well-organized and have high levels of faculty involvement. Faculty members reported they have both autonomy and collegiality. The team found consistently that faculty, across all programs, are committed to the mission, vision and objectives of the School of Education.

#### Strengths

No additional strengths noted.

#### Concerns

Since the Experimental Teacher Education Program was launched, three different individuals have provided leadership to the program. Lack of continuity in the leadership, while not significantly impacting the quality of the program, has had some impact on the overall leadership within the School.

### Standard 2: Resources

### Standard Met

Adequate resources are available for support of all credential programs. In addition to base funding for personnel and operating expenses, library, media and computer facilities are excellent. Additional resources from grants and funded projects supplement the programs, particularly the TEP and PPS programs.

The offices and teaching stations for the Teacher Education Program were recently remodeled. Classrooms, computer labs and electronic technologies are available to both faculty and candidates. Two state-of-the-art computer labs provide both Macintosh and PC stations and give students the opportunity to develop skills in dual platforms which they may encounter in their school assignments.

#### Strengths

No additional strengths noted.

#### Concerns

None noted.

**Standard 3: Faculty****Standard Met**

The faculty of the Graduate School of Education have degrees and experience appropriate to their field of expertise and the areas in which they teach. Interviews documented a high regard for GSE faculty by other faculty within the University. An effort has been made to hire the most qualified part-time faculty and supervisors. Attention has been paid to selecting individuals who share the unit's philosophy of education.

The institution provides adequate support for faculty hiring and development and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching. The performance of all faculty, both full and part time, is regularly evaluated. Students have adequate opportunity to evaluate courses and faculty. While the faculty are knowledgeable about and committed to ethnic and gender diversity, the faculty do not reflect the ethnic diversity of the service area.

Though the Administrative Services and School Psychology programs have a number of tenure-track faculty, the Teacher Education Program has only one professorial rank faculty position.

**Strengths**

Students and graduates alike, across credential areas, reported deep satisfaction with both the caliber and the commitment of the faculty at UCSB. A number of graduates mentioned by name faculty who have had a significant impact on their professional lives.

**Concerns**

There appears to be a preponderance of part time faculty providing the majority of supervision in the Teacher Education Program, which has the potential to undermine program cohesiveness.

**Standard 4: Evaluation****Standard Met**

The School of Education sponsors numerous program evaluation activities allowing graduates, practitioners, faculty and students to have significant input into the development of the program. Various program advisory committees are active in providing feedback and helping to shape policy. Cooperating teachers, principals and advisory councils indicate there is opportunity for professional practitioners and community members to become involved in program design, development and evaluation activities. The chair of the Teacher Education Department and school site representatives provided examples where changes in policies and programs had resulted from reviewing the data from various evaluation activities.

**Strengths**

After the first experimental year, the Teacher Education Program saw a need for additional data to verify the quality of the program. The accreditation team was impressed with the responsiveness of the program leadership in adjusting their research design to allow for the collection of additional data with the intent of modifying the program based on evaluation of that data.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

## **Standard 5 : Admissions**

## **Standard Met**

Admissions criteria and procedures are clearly described and available to students. Students reported that the admissions process was efficient and smooth. The admissions standards are high and a review of student files reflects strong adherence to these standards. Requirements for admission include a 3.0 GPA (which exceeds the Commission's standard), GRE or GMAT scores, completion of the CBEST and completion of either the MSAT or the appropriate PRAXIS or SSAT. A significant number of applicants are not admitted to the program because they do not meet admission criteria. There is an established process for special admission, but very few students seek a special admission waiver.

### **Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

### **Concerns**

The institution's efforts to recruit ethnically diverse students have not resulted in significant increases in their enrollment.

## **Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**

## **Standard Met**

Students and graduates reported that the quality of advising and assistance activities contributed to successful and timely completion of their programs. It was also reported by students and graduates that faculty and staff are consistently available, knowledgeable and willing to provide guidance and support. Evidence such as handbooks, catalogs and brochures and informational resources are readily available and of high quality. The Graduate School of Education has well-established procedures to assist students and to insure that only successful candidates are advanced into the profession.

### **Strengths**

Students and graduates across all programs reported that the Office of the Credential Analyst provided high quality assistance and advisement.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

**Standard 7: School Collaboration****Standard Met**

The GSE has a commitment to providing extensive field experiences as essential elements of the professional preparation of candidates. Programs integrate such experiences in ways which reflect the unit's philosophy of education. Based on site visits and interviews with school personnel, the team found that the University has established a strong collaborative relationship with K-12 schools in several districts. The partnerships established with the cooperating schools are working well. Reports from University and school personnel and a review of documents indicate that on-going evaluation of cooperating teachers, supervisors and cooperating school sites is occurring and that candidates' placements are selected collaboratively.

**Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

**Concerns**

None noted.

**Standard 8: District Field Supervisors****Standard Met**

The University uses six partner schools for most student teaching placements. Administrative and school psychology placements utilize additional sites. Reports from students, supervisors, graduates and district personnel indicate that an effective process exists for selection of district-employed cooperating teachers/ supervisors. The University provides opportunities for district cooperating teachers to receive training. However, due to the voluntary nature of the training, participation is inconsistent.

**Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

**Concerns**

None noted.

## Experimental Teacher Education Program

### Experimental Standard #1

### Standard Met

#### Research Questions, Hypotheses or Objectives

*Standard: The postsecondary institution submits one or more research questions, hypothesis or objectives that relate to fundamentally significant issues in the selection, preparation or assessment of prospective professional educators.*

The experimental teacher education program at UC Santa Barbara is based on the University's plan to develop a program based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The three objectives related to the desire of University personnel to (1) understand better the process and outcomes of the use of new standards in the preparation of teachers; (2) the process and outcomes of "pushing" the use of standards into an undergraduate program; and (3) the process and outcomes of establishing institutional and personnel linkages in the local Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program.

#### Strengths

The CSTP are well integrated into the Multiple Subjects and Single Subject programs. The student portfolios show a strong understanding of the CSTP. Student teacher evaluations at the mid-term and final points use the CSTP as a framework. There is a positive sense of community and support, which results both from the partnerships between the schools and the University and from the interaction within the cohort.

#### Concerns

The objective of integrating the undergraduate program into the experimental program has not been fully realized. The few teachers who participated in the Multiple Subjects Preparation Program (MSPP) as undergraduates indicated that they were well prepared to enter the credential program, particularly with regard to achieving the CLAD/BCLAD competencies. However, most candidates reported that they were unaware of this program opportunity.

### Experimental Standard #2 - Research Design

### Standard Met

*Standard: The postsecondary institution submits a research design that would clearly resolve the research questions, test the hypotheses, or attain the objectives in the course of operating the program.*

Multiple data collection procedures to gather information from a variety of sources are being used to evaluate, assess, and modify the program. Data from years one and two have been aggregated and reported. After the first year of the experimental program, the leadership recognized the need to gather expanded data to verify the quality of the program and to address the need to augment or refine the program. The original design was amended to collect additional data from program graduates.

#### Strengths

No additional strengths noted.

#### Concerns

None noted.

### **Experimental Standard #3 - Potential for Improved Service**

### **Standard Met**

*Standard: The postsecondary institution submits a research proposal that shows clearly that the knowledge generated by operating the experimental program could eventually and generally improve the quality of service authorized by the credential.*

University and on-site personnel in the Multiple Subject program report that they are aware of the CSTP and use the domains in their teaching. The use of the CSTP domains by all student teachers is in evidence in their lesson plans and portfolios.

Graduates indicate that they were well-prepared for teaching as a result of participating in the experimental program. Multiple Subject teachers mention their work in assessment as being particularly valuable. Two years into teaching, they are still using materials gathered during their credential program and still reflecting on their practice. They express appreciation for the assistance available from the cooperating teachers, the on-site university supervisors and their instructors. They also appreciated the opportunity to meet, on a regular basis, with other student teachers and to commiserate and address and solve problems. Collaboration between and among the school and university partners is mentioned as a strong point.

### **Strengths**

Single Subject student teachers report strong collaboration among the SST faculty in their courses. They describe the community of learners and the developmental appropriateness of their on-campus courses, along with their ability to articulate mastery of the CSTP, as particular strengths of the program.

### **Concerns**

The addition of the Master of Education program to the credential program within the allotted time frame adds a participant stress level that may detract from both programs. Students and graduates indicate that the very intense nature of the programs' requirements leads to work overload for them. Consideration should be given to lengthening the time required for the Masters of Education program so that adequate time can be given to both programs.

## **California Standards for the Teaching Profession**

All six California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) have been met. The CSTP are the basis for the University's credential program and drive all instruction. Review of student portfolios, student teacher evaluations and interviews with cooperating teachers, principals, supervisors, students, and graduates indicate the importance of the CSTP in the credential program.

### **Standard #1**

#### **Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning**

#### **Standard Met**

Across content area and grade levels, current students and graduates describe in detail their ability to employ a variety of instructional strategies and use resources that respond to students diverse needs.

#### **Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

#### **Concerns**

None noted.

### **Standard #2**

#### **Developing as a Professional Educator**

#### **Standard Met**

Graduates, cooperating teachers and principals describe an element of rigorous preparation that identifies the graduates of the experimental program as compared to graduates of other teacher preparation programs. Student teachers and graduates cited the credential portfolio process and, for SST, attendance at professional conferences, as primary vehicles facilitating their development in this area.

#### **Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

#### **Concerns**

None noted.

**Standard #3****Assessing Student Learning****Standard Met**

Graduates indicate that they are well versed in assessment, mentioning especially the literacy assessments and the portfolios. Graduate interviews revealed consistent emphasis on using learning goals as the basis for their teaching and assessment.

**Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

**Concerns**

None noted.

**Standard #4****Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments  
for Student Learning****Standard Met**

Principals' criteria for hiring faculty include an emphasis on community building; they describe this as a strength of the graduates from this experimental program. In addition to graduates, cooperating teachers, student teachers and supervisors report that this domain is part and parcel of their daily lives at partnership schools.

**Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

**Concerns**

None noted.

**Standard #5****Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter  
for Student Learning****Standard Met**

Student teachers and graduates across grade -levels and content areas report they are able to provide interdisciplinary lessons organized around central themes, concepts and skills. This claim was substantiated in a review of their lesson plans and credential portfolio artifacts.

**Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

**Concerns**

None noted

**Standard #6**  
**Planning Instruction and Designing Learning**  
**Experiences for All Students**

**Standard Met**

Student teachers report multiple opportunities from the beginning of the program to plan and execute lessons. Graduates indicate they are well prepared for their own classrooms and are able to initiate programs and curricula that enable students to master learning goals. They are able to modify those plans using information about student learning styles, ability, language and culture.

**Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

**Concerns**

None noted.

## **Administrative Services Credential Preliminary and Professional Levels**

### **Findings on Standards**

The Administrative Services programs for the Preliminary/Tier One and the Professional/Tier Two credentials meet all prescribed standards. With respect to the Tier Two program there are three standards (*Standard 8- Design of the Professional Credential Induction Plan; Standard 12- Curriculum Content; and Standard 18 - Nature of Non-University Activities*) which are judged to have been met minimally due to certain qualitative concerns (see below). The curriculum required of candidates at the Preliminary/Tier One level provides thorough coverage of the related program standards. Additionally the field work component provides candidates with structured experiences in administrative and leadership functions. The Professional/Tier Two program is designed, in its entirety, with a strong commitment to providing practicing administrators with a highly individualized experience. The elective curriculum that is made available to candidates in Tier Two is broad and speaks to the conceptual areas appropriate to that level. Program faculty at both levels are highly qualified and for the most part are full-time and ladder-rank. Numerous interviews with current students and graduates indicated a high level of satisfaction with the programs and the levels of support and encouragement received from faculty and staff.

#### **Standard 8 - Design of the Professional Credential Induction Plan**

#### **Met Minimally: Qualitative Concerns**

The induction plan design which is currently operant is organized through ED596 and has no developed course syllabus or materials. There is no designated final assessment course through which the completion of the commitments made in the induction plan are documented/verified. The lack of a final assessment component with designated units of credit appears to be in conflict with Precondition 15 for Professional Administrative Services Programs. Because of the small numbers of students in the program the Coordinator is able to monitor individual progress toward goals, but with any increase in numbers such an informal approach may prove to be problematic.

#### **Standard 12 - Curriculum Content**

#### **Met Minimally: Qualitative Concerns**

As noted above the total curriculum presented as part of the Professional program is broad and conceptually appropriate for the level. However, in practice, students are only required to take three (12 quarter units) of the proffered courses and those on a self-selected basis. While this three course selection is augmented by the year-long action research course it seems unlikely that all students will address the five thematic areas prescribed by this Standard. Student course selection is not monitored for breadth and thus it is possible for a given student to fulfill program requirements by taking a rather narrow range of course work. It is noted that this "menu" of course selections is part of the commendable goal to make this a highly individualized program. That goal notwithstanding, it is difficult to see how the broad thematic issues addressed in this Standard can be met with certainty.

## **Standard 18 - Nature of Non-University Activities**

## **Met Minimally: Qualitative Concerns**

Here, too, the desire to provide students with a highly individualized and self-designed program, while commendable, has made the attainment of this Standard difficult. The program, consistent with Standard 17, does provide students with the opportunity to include up to 120 hours of non-university professional development as part of the fulfillment of their requirements. Standard 18 establishes that such non-university activities must be based on a coherent design and be delivered by qualified individuals, supported by appropriate resources and evaluated on an on-going basis. Interviews of graduates and review of student and university materials related to this Standard indicate that there is not yet a formalized system of approval of such activities including direct review/approval from the program coordinator during the induction phase of the program nor is there a formal documentation of the completion of such activities. Possibly because of the lack of prior review/approval it appears that some candidates have used activities which were not developmental in nature but rather were directly job-related. Another graduate reported that she presented brochures and flyers of workshops/meetings attended over the past three years to meet the 120 hour requirement.

### **Strengths**

As noted above current students and graduates indicate much appreciation for the support and individual attention they have received from the program coordinator, faculty and staff. Several students also commended the program for the recent addition of a field supervisor who has already made significant contributions. During site visits it was apparent that the program coordinator has developed excellent working relationships with school site and district level administrators. At the Tier One Preliminary level, the program is to be commended for the development of two practicum-type courses (ED249D and ED249E) which address issues in human resource management and the use of technology from the perspectives of school administrators actively engaged in those areas. At the Tier Two Professional level, the year-long course in Action Research (ED236ABC) provides an excellent example of how actual problems and questions generated at the school site and school district level can provide the vehicle to drive student engagement with theoretical and research considerations. Faculty members collaborating in this course received many accolades from graduates.

### **Concerns**

Substantive concerns regarding program weaknesses were noted above. The definition of the role and the responsibilities of the mentor in the Tier Two program should receive continued attention from the program coordinator.

## **Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Psychology Program**

### **Findings On Standards**

Based on interviews with current students, program graduates, faculty, supervisors and employers, in addition to review of program documents and student files, the team finds that all program standards are met.

The program is balanced and relevant; courses embrace current knowledge and practices of the field. The students profit from an enthusiastic, well-qualified faculty who, themselves, are actively involved with research, professional practices and teaching. The faculty and candidates work effectively with local school districts, providing the candidates with excellent practica and field work settings. The Advisory Committee is very supportive of the program and its goals and feels their suggestions for the program are seriously considered by the faculty and incorporated into the program.

The program has attained provisional approval by the National Association of School Psychologists and it is expected that full approval will be granted soon. This accreditation indicates that the program meets national standards for training of students for the profession of school psychology. Practica and internship requirements are fully met, and the students receive faculty supervision throughout the program as well as on-site supervision by the practicing school psychologists.

### **Strengths**

The faculty are to be commended for the development of a program of studies that prepares candidates for the profession of school psychology. The program is well organized, integrating academic courses and field work practica that prepare the student for their professional psychology roles. Some of the courses are offered on alternate years - because of the small number of students admitted each year - but, in general, the basic courses that are prerequisite for practica are given each year.

The faculty members of the program are mutually supportive, very approachable and knowledgeable. A strength of the program is the intensive interaction between faculty and students that results from the mentoring, supervision and collaboration in research activities. Program advisement seems a continuing process. The faculty should be commended on the development, coordination and integration of a program of high quality that addresses academic and practitioner aspects of psychology.

### **Concerns**

There are some academic courses that rely as much on student presentations as on faculty expertise or lectures. While this presents the student with a challenge for learning, it may deprive the student of gaining a breadth of knowledge that the professor could offer. However, this comment is not intended to detract from the quality of the program.

## **Professional Comments**

### **Common Standards**

The University should investigate the possibility of new and/or increased incentives for cooperating teachers/supervisors to participate in University-sponsored training.

### **Multiple and Single Subject Program**

The experimental program, by using the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) as the basis for the credential program, has produced graduates who are well prepared to enter the teaching profession according to their own assessment and that of their supervisors.

Consideration should be given to incorporating the CSTP explicitly into course syllabi so that new instructors can readily identify these standards in the course content and activities. An overall matrix to guide others as to where to locate the standards in each course would be helpful.

Continued efforts should be made to facilitate student entrance into the MSPP program. Creation of an education minor is strongly recommended to facilitate the necessary preparation for the credential program and to provide a clear route for undergraduates who decide early that they would like to pursue a teaching credential.

Completion of the graduate data analysis should occur as soon as possible in order to inform changes in the current program.

Based on recommendations of student teachers and program staff, the team recommends that the University continue to work closely with the partnership schools to refine programs to address the literacy and content needs of English learners and BCLAD candidates.

The in-house coordinator position at each partnership school should be re-examined. They may be in the delicate position as site teachers who may also be cooperating teachers who must help make decisions about colleagues and the placement and removal of students. Several graduates and in-house supervisors voiced concern about the position.

In order to ensure that candidates have access to cooperating teachers who are well versed in the CSTP, additional incentives could be considered to encourage the cooperating teachers to attend workshops where these domains are discussed.

### **Administrative Services Credential**

The team suggests that faculty involved in the Tier One Preliminary program study the impact on program enrollment of the 52 units of credit required to complete the program. Certainly as noted above, this extensive requirement provides students with a very thorough treatment of the involved Standards, but it may also be a factor in the small size of this program. It is possible that some consolidation of current courses could occur while still maintaining coverage appropriate to this level. An example might be the two four unit courses currently devoted to legal issues. Another factor may include the current use of the GRE for credential-only students. Another area for faculty review is the observation from some students that the credential and doctoral programs do not appear to have a unifying theme or rationale. One student, who was very complimentary about individual courses, stated that she was surprised by the lack of cohesiveness and integration between and among courses.

### **Pupil Personnel Services Credential**

The current concerns in the school system, as well as in professional psychology, are undergoing a change. One of the concerns that has developed is the need for "safe schools" and the program certainly has a head start in training their students in this area. Two other suggestions have emerged from the discussions: First, there were several comments on the need for a course in neuropsychology, with an emphasis on the use and effects of psychopharmacological treatments with children. And secondly, there is a need for more thorough knowledge and training in the area of family dynamics and counseling.

Finally, the students seemed unable to conceptualize a theoretical basis for their approach to processes of learning or to counseling activities. It might be beneficial to frame discussions of problems using theoretical perspectives more actively in order to provide a broader framework that would encourage generalizations from and application of principles of learning and counseling.